

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1359858



Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

From the library of
E. PEARCE HAYES

BS
1225
C65
F6

COLENZO'S FALLACIES:

ANOTHER

REVIEW OF THE BISHOP OF NATAL.

BY

REV. C. H. FOWLER, A. M.

WITH

AN INTRODUCTORY ESSAY AND REVIEW OF PART II,

BY REV. HENRY BANNISTER, D. D.,

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND GREEK EXEGESIS AND BIBLICAL CRITICISM
IN THE GARRETT BIBLICAL INSTITUTE.

"Facts are stubborn things."

"Figures can not lie."



CINCINNATI:

PUBLISHED BY POE & HITCHCOCK.

R. P. THOMPSON, PRINTER.

1864.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1864,

BY POE & HITCHCOCK,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern
District of Ohio.

PREFACE.

It is due the public, due the many writers who have so ably handled Colenso's book, and due me to state briefly how I came to venture into such a contest with such an opponent. When Colenso's book appeared, Dr. T. M. Eddy, editor of the *North-Western Christian Advocate*, requested me to write a review of it. After much hesitancy I consented, and as soon as my arduous duties would allow, I published the main body of the argument in the *North-Western*. In the argument I have tried to exhibit Colenso's radical fallacies, and to meet his arguments one by one in their order. Whatever others might think of it, I felt that it removed Colenso's difficulties, so far as my own mind was concerned. I felt paid for my labor by this fact, for I could

not preach a doctrine or system which was without foundation. I would not bow my soul one hour to any dogma which is not clearly supported by calm, honest reasoning. I can not take a truth which is logically worthless. In the double assurance of the purity and veracity of the Scriptures, which this investigation has given me, and in the approval of Him whose I am, and whom I serve, I looked for my reward. I had no idea that the argument would ever take any other form; but, at the request of Drs. Clark, Harris, Eddy, and others, and with the approval of Henry Bannister, D. D., I have added a review of Colenso's Introduction and Preface, and now give it to the public in this form, hoping for it only some usefulness.

C. H. FOWLER.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER.	PAGE.
PREFACE.....	3
INTRODUCTORY ESSAY AND REVIEW OF PART	
II, BY DR. BANNISTER.....	7
I. STATEMENT OF THE SUBJECT.....	23
II. COLENZO'S POSITION.....	30
III. THE BEARINGS OF COLENZO'S VIEWS UPON THE	
NEW TESTAMENT.....	42
IV. THE REAL QUESTION BEFORE US.....	56
V. THE QUESTION OF INSPIRATION.....	61
VI. DIFFICULTIES IN COLENZO'S "INTRODUCTORY	
REMARKS".....	67
VII. THE FAMILY OF JUDAH.....	80
VIII. THE SIZE OF THE COURT OF THE TABERNACLE	
COMPARED WITH THE NUMBER OF THE CON-	
GREGATION.....	89
IX. MOSES AND JOSHUA ADDRESSING ALL ISRAEL.	94
X. THE EXTENT OF THE CAMP COMPARED WITH	
THE PRIESTS' DUTIES AND THE DAILY NE-	
CESSITIES OF THE PEOPLE.....	98

CHAPTER.	PAGE.
XI. THE NUMBER OF THE PEOPLE AT THE FIRST MUSTER COMPARED WITH THE POLL-TAX RAISED SIX MONTHS PREVIOUSLY.....	101
XII. THE TENTS AND ARMS OF THE ISRAELITES.	106
XIII. THE INSTITUTION OF THE PASSOVER.....	107
XIV. THE MARCH OUT OF EGYPT.....	113
XV. THE SHEEP AND CATTLE OF THE ISRAEL- ITES IN THE DESERT.....	116
XVI. THE NUMBER OF ISRAELITES COMPARED WITH THE EXTENT OF THE LAND OF CANAAN.....	121
XVII. THE NUMBER OF FIRST-BORN COMPARED WITH THE NUMBER OF MALE ADULTS...	123
XVIII. THE SOJOURNING OF THE ISRAELITES IN EGYPT, AND THE EXODUS IN THE FOURTH GENERATION.....	127
XIX. THE NUMBER OF THE ISRAELITES AT THE EXODUS.....	134
XX. THE REMAINING OBJECTIONS.....	136

INTRODUCTION.

WHOEVER is familiar with the course of free thought, and the so-called critical inquiry into the character of the Sacred Scriptures for the last generation or two among the Biblical scholars in Germany, has no need to feel surprise at the general spread—though late—of this spirit of criticism among intellectual classes, both in England and America. Thought and novel views, though dressed in ever so fallacious modes, will travel. Theories that in Germany have become almost effete from their errors and unsatisfactoriness, are now put forth in the English language as worthy of greedy reception. The number of men of high learning, who now represent the school of independent criticism on the continent, is continually diminishing—Ewald

and Hupfeld being the chief in Germany, and Ernest Renau in France; while many in England, and some in this country, are just beginning to shine forth as stars in this line. Is it because the Anglo-Saxon mind is so dull, and perceives so slowly, that it begins at this late day to awake into a high interest in what the Teutons are casting away as stale and sapless? Or is our language so wanting in depth and tone as to keep our ideas floating on the surface till they receive a large infusion of spirit and thought from the *Fatherland of Speculation*? Doubtless, neither of these. An unquestionable good reason is, that with institutions civil, social, and commercial, to create and perpetually to mold, we deal almost solely with the practical and the concrete; willing, for the most part, to leave deductions from the sphere of the critical and the abstract to the meditations of our less busy neighbors.

But a class of persons would say—and are saying—that the *chief* reason is far otherwise.

They assign the difference between us and the German thinkers and students to the freedom allowed to speculation and critical thought with the latter, and to the restraints and fetters of dogmatism by which our own communities are bound. And they complain grievously of heavy clamors raised against all independent minds, however sincere and ingenuous, who venture an opinion at variance with authorized creed or symbol. They allege that large classes of thoughtful and morally-earnest men are literally in a state of unrest as to the religious questions of the day; and when a bold spirit within the folds of orthodoxy, like the Essayists, or like Bishop Colenso, shall dare to break from its trammels, and freely utter itself of its difficulties, it is no wonder that thousands, escaping under such auspices from beneath the repressing weight of dogmatic authority, shall, as by an elastic but indefinite rebound, fly away into all manner of reckless protests and disbeliefs. With ingenuous and earnest persons, they say,

the spirit of inquiry is irrepressible, and the harder the restraint you place upon it, the more determined will be the effort to break from it; and the only safeguard against a violent and narrow skepticism is a generous freedom of opinion, with no tribunals *in terrorem* for every so-called heretical aberration.

There is both truth and sophistry in these allegations. It is true that the exercise of thinking not only should be, but is, as free as the air, and no human power can repress it. This is the inviolable birthright of all men. There could be no recognizable advance in knowledge without it; no propositions of thought would be formed; no waymarks to science could be set up; no goal could be fixed in the distance to which to direct the soul's thoughts and aspirations. It is true, also, that freedom of religious opinion is an absolute right to every individual. To repress this would be an act of spiritual despotism, as shocking to the free spirit of the Gospel as it would be an unwarranted violence against the

principles of our Protestantism. It is only by a reverent use of this right, the use of critical but prayerful inquiry, that the sacred deposit of Divine truth—or, in other words, a definite treasure of religious doctrine—has been discovered. It was so from the beginning. When God revealed his purposes and thoughts to men, the use of their reason was put in requisition to comprehend those revelations; and it continues so to the present time. But it is a strange view of the history of our race to suppose that no result has yet been attained from the free exercise of religious thought during all the ages past—no body of doctrine collected worthy to bow down to as authority. Those who feel crushed under the despotism of religious dogmas, never complain much of their mental sufferings under authoritative systems of jurisprudence and civil law. The expounders of these systems have gone clear of opprobrium, while teachers of religion are tabooed as tyrants over free mind and conscience. The truth is, the freest

thinkers are the greatest dogmatizers. They croak about the slavery of thought among the religious sects, and, as substitutes for the long-settled symbols of Christendom, they each commend their own differing theories. Authority they can not, in the nature of things, ignore; the limitations of finite mind compel a submission to a supreme decision of some kind. Hence, as a last resort, the ABSOLUTE RELIGION—a religious abstraction existing as a common possession in the faculties of the race—is made the ultimate arbiter.

This is the goal which Bishop Colenso would surely reach, if it were possible, to *unmake* him from his constitutional tendency to think always in the concrete. In his volume, Part I, which the following review of Mr. Fowler attends to with such admirable directness and concentrated force, he seldom cuts loose his conceptions from his favorite science of numbers; he can not render thought abstract by disengaging it of its factors; he is thus unable to see the points of

view from which the narratives of the Pentateuch were written; the mode of conception in those narratives he wholly mistakes, and so misstates; unable to discern any difference between ancient and modern idioms of speech, he is led to assertions and violent assumptions which even a child would not admit; and yet, after emasculating by his tests the Pentateuch and Joshua of every shred of historic truth, after attempting to destroy all confidence in the inspired character of those Scriptures to which the prophets, the Savior, and the apostles referred as absolute authority for their own teachings, what do you imagine he reserves for his and our feet to stand on as our eternal foundation? Simply that remainder of Truth to be found only in the devout *spirit* of those writings; and a spirit of truth to be found, "not in the Bible only, but also out of the Bible—not to us Christians only, but to our fellow-men of all climes and countries, ages and religions."* It is the

* Part I. p. 222

Universal Religion, then—his mind is not formed to grasp the Pantheistic Absolute Religion—to which he pays court; of which, in his view, Christ's spirit was the embodiment—his references, quotations, allusions, and so forth, to writings of old being only accommodating illustrations of it. To this, Colenso bows with supreme devotion and awe. This is his authority; and he would that the boundaries of the Church of England were enlarged “to make her all that a national Church should be,” embracing in her fold the Holyoakes, and Martineaus, and Westminster Review writers, “and all the piety, and learning, and earnestness, and goodness of the nation.”

Does it become Colenso and his school to utter their groans about intolerance? If you are in your citadel, and some of your men lay trains to fire your magazine simply to level the walls which divide and defend you from your foes, because, as *they* in their wisdom deem it, the occasion for defensive measures no longer

exists, which, between yourself and your conspirators, would be the *intolerant* men? In a light like to this we can not but regard the case of Bishop Colenso. He will not resign; he can not heed friendly counsel to retire; he defies civil and ecclesiastical action; he will be a martyr, if he must be; or if not dealt with he shall batter away still on the bulwarks of the Church.

And he has written another book—his Second Part—in which, like the former effort, he has brought forward not one *new* thing—not one objection or position which has not been a score of times disposed of. All his salient points of inquiry originated *for substance* with the rationalists long time ago, and have been met, and for years put *hors de combat*, by rejoinders as searching and comprehensive as the critical assailants could well desire. Having in his first book addressed himself to the work of demolishing the authority of the Pentateuch as an historical record, in his second volume he sets himself to prove that it was written, not by

Moses, but probably by Samuel—at least, the groundwork of it—but touched and retouched, and finally completed, by later authors. He admits that his arithmetic fails him as an instrument of criticism here, and that his field of operation is one of conjecture. Yet he echoes the old-fashioned views of his German masters, that the original narrative consisted of at least *two* characteristic compositions or documents, known respectively as the Elohist and the Jehovist documents. The two names of Deity, Elohim and Jehovah, distinguishing them, are usually admitted by those who maintain the historical accuracy of the Pentateuch to mean—the one, Deity as worshiped by the Patriarchs; the other, Deity as pledged to be the covenant God of the Israelites. Nevertheless, both names involve essentially the same meaning, the accidental difference, if any, being that there is conceived the aspect of Divine power more in the one, and the aspect of self-existence more in the other. But certainly both names are

often used interchangeably in the Old Testament. This, however, Colenso disputes. But as his positions are confessedly based on conjecture, his arguments amount to nothing. Our object is not a review, but a mere notice of his arguments, which, with brief comments, we append to each, are substantially as follows:

1. He thinks that a difference of authorship of these documents is proved by contradictory statements in them. But we think the following searching review of Mr. Fowler shows that it is not so proved. There is no essential contradiction in the entire narrative.

2. He *conjectures* that the author of the one document uses exclusively the name Elohim, and the author of the other, exclusively, the name Jehovah. But how is this even *conjecturally* proved? Not by difference of style in other respects; nor because it is ever claimed that Elohim is a different being from Jehovah; nor because the two names were *not* sometimes interchangeably used.

3. He thinks that because the name Jehovah was not ostensibly revealed till the occurrence of the event mentioned in Exodus vi, 3, therefore the Elohist and the Jehovistic writers are proved to be different persons. What child may not see that this does not follow? Must Genesis have been *necessarily* written before the event of revealing the name Jehovah took place, as described in the sixth chapter of Exodus?

4. He claims that, as far as to the story of Joseph, individual names receive more or less the letters of the name Elohim, but none of the name Jehovah; and this he considers strong evidence of different authorship, because later in the Pentateuch, as well as in Joshua, the letters of the name Jehovah are found more or less in individual names. Strong evidence! strong trifling, rather! What has the fact that parents name their children as they please to do with an author's narrating this circumstance in after ages? But the assumption is not to be admitted for a moment that such is the

case, as any one may ascertain by consulting almost any page in Genesis, where names occur, and as the representative names, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph also disprove; and if it were, of what value to the argument would be the isolated letters *e* and *l* and *m* in an occasional name?

These are but specimens of the sort of criticism relied on by Bishop Colenso to sustain the grave position that the Pentateuch was not written by Moses. But as it is no object of this article to enter into a formal discussion with this his second argument against the historical character of the Pentateuch, we close by saying we regard this far the weaker of his two books, proceeding as it does throughout on a *petitio principii*, with reference to the meaning and scope of the sacred names ELOHIM and JEHOVAH. There is no agreement among the destructive theorizers respecting them; and Hengstenberg, and Kurtz, and Keil, and other reactionary champions, have not yet been displaced from their unanimous sentiments upon them.

In this second volume Colenso exhibits a more deep and deadly committal to the work of destroying confidence in the Bible; and the next book, which he assures us will soon be forthcoming, will doubtless show him still more relentless and unsparing. The die is cast with him; and from being, as he was perhaps in the start, an honest and earnest inquirer, he will proceed on till—by reason of his ill-balanced and consequently ill-judging mind—he will become, we fear, under evil influences, both a bad and dangerous man.

But the foundations are sure. We will not deprecate this ruthless—this destructive criticism. The English mind was recently moved from its theological lethargy by the issue of the “*Essays and Reviews*.” But a thousand pens were soon astir; and now may we reasonably hope that stronger and more definite views of Biblical doctrine and fact will be eliminated from the literature that has been produced on these assaults against our precious Bible. So

of Colenso and his doings. Little harm and much good will come of them. Those predisposed to skepticism will wax stronger for a time. But the sifting that is set on foot will soon distinguish the chaff from the wheat, the dross from the gold—and the former shall be, as always aforesaid, the unsatisfying food of the skeptic; while the latter shall continue the solid sustaining substance of the lover of revealed truth. The Scriptures will not be the ultimate sufferer for the ordeal they are now passing. A thousand-fold the gainer shall they be. Many misapprehensions of Biblical statement may perchance be corrected in this trial. Investigation of points heretofore unnoticed, because unsailed, will result in establishing and strongly fortifying new outposts. Discussion will originate many arguments before unthought of for the truth. Some new constructions may require to be adopted; some new attitudes of mind may be demanded; some new points of view may be taken, from which to look at certain scenes of

the divine narrative. All candor shall be exercised toward suggestions and instructions that unwittingly may come even from the enemy. So let it be settled in all minds—the truth of God is in no danger. The duty of its defenders is rather to welcome its assailants and give vigorous battle in return, than to fear and tremble, and cry out, “If the foundations be removed, what can the righteous do?” *We welcome and warmly commend the new defender herewith ensuing.*

H. BANNISTER.

COLENSO'S FALLACIES.

CHAPTER I.

STATEMENT OF THE SUBJECT.

THE Athenian orator in opening his orations was wont to invoke the aid of all the gods and goddesses, that he might be guided to right results in his search for truth. In undertaking any work that may affect the faith, and, consequently, the destiny of my fellow-men, I can not do less. Believing, as I most sincerely do, that God sends his Spirit to enlighten his children when they ask it, I humbly pray for the guidance of that Spirit which is sent into the world to lead men "into all truth." Knowing that it is so much easier to *denounce* than to *refute*, and so much more natural to censure than to commiser-

ate, I humbly ask that the Great Father—father alike of the erring and of the obedient—may enable me to walk carefully along that path of charity so seldom pressed by the feet of disputants!

In controversy, the weapons are arguments; the material, facts; the science, logic; and the result sought, truth. Thus name and position are excluded—combatants always meet as equals. A fact in the mouth of a *lad* is as much a fact as it would be in the mouth of a sage. From this follow two conclusions, which I beg the reader to remember: 1. That where the *logic* drives us we *must go*; 2. That the former or present character of Colenso is *not* an element in the calculation. If his objections are sound and unanswerable, they remain so *in spite* of his bad character; if they are *not*, his having a good character *would not help them*. Yet it may not be amiss to give some of the facts of Colenso's life and character.

1. His public life sums up thus: He has acquired some little reputation as a scholar—has published a few works which have been well

received by the public. His chief characteristic is his mathematical endowment, which when *sane* was his glory, but now is his notoriety and ruin. His first productions were some works on mathematics. Then followed four or five small books aiming at being devotional. The first symptoms of his monomania, which I regard as the most charitable explanation of his stupendous fallacies, appeared in his next work, claiming to be a translation and exposition of the Epistle to the Romans from "a missionary point of view." In this he succeeds in taking the life out of the Gospel by rationalizing conversion and justification. Late in 1862 he fully committed his history and his soul to the cause of infidelity in the work which we are now considering. That its contradictions and imbecility defeat and deaden its malignity I trust we shall see before we close these few pages.

2. We speak next of Colenso's progress in infidelity. From a careful study of his Preface, which he so shrewdly puts in from an unmailed

letter to a friend, one is impressed with this fact, that Bishop Colenso, by the order of the Church of England, went to Natal to convert the Zulus, and the Zulus—intelligent natives—converted him; and in the zeal infused by his new light, he goes back to England to convert the Church to Zulu and skepticism. See the process by which he was led to give up the Pentateuch—pages 4 and 5. After speaking of his thorough knowledge of the Zulu tongue, he says:

“Thus, however, it has happened that I have been brought again face to face with questions which caused me some uneasiness in former days, but with respect to which I was then enabled to satisfy my mind sufficiently for practical purposes, and I had fondly hoped to have laid the ghosts of them at last forever. Engrossed with parochial and other work in England, I did what, probably, many other clergymen have done under similar circumstances—I contented myself with silencing, by means of the specious explanations which are given in most commentaries,

the ordinary objections against the historical character of the early portions of the Old Testament, and settled down into a willing acquiescence in the general truth of the narrative, whatever difficulties might still hang about particular parts of it. In short, the doctrinal and devotional portions of the Bible were what were needed most in parochial duty. And, if a passage of the Old Testament formed at any time the subject of a sermon, it was easy to draw from it practical lessons of daily life, without examining closely into the historical truth of the narrative. It is true, there were one or two stories which presented great difficulties, too prominent not to be noticed, and which were brought every now and then before us in the Lessons of the Church, such, *e. g.*, as the account of the Creation and the Deluge. But, on the whole, I found so much of Divine light and life in these and other parts of the Sacred Book—so much wherewith to feed my own soul and the souls of others—that I was content to take all

this for granted, as being true in the main, however wonderful, and as being at least capable, in an extreme case, of *some* sufficient explanation."

This looks like a plain statement, and it must be either true or false. If he did not find Divine light and life, and much to feed his own soul and the souls of others, he is *perjured*; if he did, he exhibits an ingratitude measured only by his irrationality in rejecting a system full of "light, and life, and food," for a system that is dark, and dead, and "enfamined." What can measure the unkindness to the race of a man who, because he finds God's Word analogous to his providence, in that it contains things too deep for a little finite mind, and here and there a statement capable of misconstruction, on this account rejects that Word so full of "practical lessons of daily life," containing "so much of Divine life and light," and puts in its stead a system which can never reach down to the common people, and can never safely guide even the learned! However unreasonable it may be, Co-

lenso, by the questions of a Zulu native, has been forced to let go his hold upon the truth, and put his eternity at stake, when his only hope hangs on his success in battering down the pillars of God's throne. With the simple statements of Christ before him, that against the Church "the gates of hell shall not prevail," (Matt. xvi, 18;) and, "Verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled," (Matt. v, 18,) it must have seemed a faint hope upon which to hazard a soul.

CHAPTER II.

COLENSO'S POSITION.

COLENSO'S ground must be fairly understood, then we will know where to meet him, and how to measure his arguments.

1. He is flatly and squarely infidel. He does attempt to conceal this by putting himself forward as the disciple of the "God of truth," and affirming his faith in the possibility of miracles, yet his position, declaring the unhistorical character of the Pentateuch, unmasks his true character. Read what he says on page 53, and decide for yourself.

We need only consider well the statements made in the books themselves, by whomsoever written, about matters which they profess to narrate as facts of common history—statements which every clergyman, at all events, and every

Sunday school teacher, not to say every Christian, is surely bound to examine thoroughly, and try to understand rightly, comparing one passage with another till he comprehends their actual meaning, and is able to explain that meaning to others. If we do this, we shall find them to contain a series of manifest contradictions and inconsistencies, which leave us, it would seem, *no alternative* but to conclude that *main portions* of the story of the Exodus, though based, probably, on some real historical foundation, yet are *certainly not to be regarded as historically true.*"

2. Colenso commits the fearful error of making unaided reason *superior* to revelation. He puts his own ideas of God and eternity above the teachings of Jesus, whose servant he claims to be, forgetting that "the disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord." (Matt. x, 24.) Hear him from page 54, where he says:

"And it is, perhaps, God's will that we shall be taught in this our day, among other precious

lessons, not to build up our faith upon a book, though it be the Bible itself, but to realize more truly the blessedness of knowing that he himself, the living God, our father and friend, is nearer and closer to us than any book can be—that his voice within the heart may be heard continually by the obedient child that listens for it, and *that* shall be our teacher and guide, in the path of duty, which is the path of life, when all other helpers—even the words of the best of books—may fail us.”

This passage I think contains one of the main ideas running through Colenso's work. So let us examine it:

The first thing that presents itself is this: “We are not to build up our faith upon a book, though it be the Bible itself.” Now, if by “book” is simply meant so much paper in a given shape, with so many characters stamped upon it, then there is no issue between us. But if by “book” is meant the truths and teachings contained in the volume, then we are at issue. This opens

into the wide field of evidences, which I do not purpose to repeat here. They are familiar to every scholar. I only refer to this point to bring forward Colenso's true character. The heathen world without this Bible have not made much progress toward God. The facts show that they have gone all the while away from him into the darkness. History shows that all the races have taken the leap over the precipice of sin, all have tried the experiment of disobedience, and that those people which have had this book and built up their faith upon it have gone up into civilization and moral power, while the people which have rejected, or have not this book to build upon, have, without a single exception, gone down to barbarism and beastliness. If we are better without this book, why have not the Zulus sent out missionaries, before the coming of Colenso, to convert Christendom? There are some things so absurd that it is different to disprove them, and this denial of our need of the Bible is one of this class.

The second thing in this paragraph worthy of the Bishop is this: we are "to realize more truly the blessedness of knowing that he himself, the living God, our father and friend, is nearer and closer to us than any book can be." Where do we learn any thing about him as the living God, or as our father, or as our friend? Only from this book, and for these reasons, Nature can not teach us God. It does lead us to feel that there is somewhere a being or a force that works the world, but it teaches us *nothing concerning* him. The ignorant, as *all* become who have not the Bible, sum up the teachings of Nature in a block of marble, or a lump of clay, or a stick of wood, and they never get any higher. Seen from Natal, this may be an advance; but seen from America or England, it is a fearful retrograde. The learned, who, having the light which radiates from the Bible, yet reject the book itself, sum up the teachings from Nature in a thin, impalpable, ethereal idea, of a something like the subtile ether in which we and the stars float alike; at best it is

the abstract idea of power. There is no personality, no "living God," no "father," no "friend" about it. These ideas are all centered in Jesus of Nazareth, the divine man who first taught the race to pronounce, with their full meaning, those blessed words, "Our Father." Nature looked at with the dim eye of reason is but God's *shadow*, indicating to a few master-minds, endowed above their kind, not who or what that being is which revelation calls "God" and "Father," but simply that somewhere up in the infinite unknown he exists. Reason only handles the garment, while our souls want the wearer. This the race has never found, save in Christ as revealed in this book, which Colenso would have us abandon for mummeries and idols.

The third thing in this paragraph worthy of note is this, that "*his voice* within the heart shall be our teacher and guide in the path of duty, when all other helpers—even *the words of the best of books*—fail us."

By his selection of words *utterly unworthy* of

a *scientifically-accurate critic*, Colenso gets the same advantage which a rattlesnake has in the grass—you can hear him and know he is *somewhere*, but *where* you can not tell. He must mean by “his voice within the heart,” either reason, or inspiration, or conscience. I think this catalogue is exhaustive. If he means reason, his trust is poorly placed, because reason can not teach us any thing concerning the infinite, beyond mere existence and a few confused utterances about power and wisdom. If it can teach us any thing definite and positive, why has it not done it? One thinker has but set up his theory of what is true, when some other thinker has annihilated it. I will not protract—the painful fact is patent on the very face of history. If he means inspiration, why does he deny to Moses what he claims for every body else? He concedes the very thing he is combating. Why has it always happened that this “voice within,” which is to be “our teacher and guide” when the Word of God shall fail us, has always been

a false teacher and a treacherous guide? for history has not yet recorded one instance among the hundreds of millions of experiments where this guide has not led down to barbarism.

If he means conscience, he has but poorly studied psychology; for conscience never teaches or guides—it only gives point to what the judgment approves. Its character is dependent upon education. The character of its comments is taken from *what* the individual already believes. It never leads the way. And then see how it fails! There is not a creed so absurd which it has not sanctioned; there is not a crime which it has not approved; there is not an altar at which it has not bowed. Its hands have bowed the head of the martyr and lighted his death fagot. No great wrong has ever existed which has not enlisted its support. Aside from the light of the Bible, it is no criterion of right. And is this to be our guide and our teacher? Surely we must prefer the sure Word of God.

3. Colenso, judged by this book, is *unfair* and

dishonest. Under the pretense of devotion to the truth, he uses his utmost power in destroying the truth. Claiming to be a disciple, he not only sells the Lord for "thirty pieces of silver," but also joins the guard in casting lots for his garments.* At page 45 he says, "Whatever the result may be, it is our bounden duty to 'buy the truth' at any cost, even at the sacrifice, if need be, of much which we have hitherto held to be most dear and precious." Yet at page 89 he *willfully* suppresses the truth; for he omits, from the text quoted, the explanation of a term, that he may object to its not being explained. Also, page 67, he misrepresents the number of Jacob's wives—"as to Leah herself and the *other wives* of Jacob;" whereas, Colenso must have known that Jacob had *only one other wife*. But this *turn* seemed necessary to beat off the explanation of Kurtz, and, therefore, as a disciple

*He has received £30,000 from the sale of this book, and still refuses to resign his bishopric.

of the truth, it was his bounden duty to clear up his theory.

4. Colenso exhibits the same lack of honesty in his dealings with the Church, which everywhere characterizes his treatment of the Bible. In reference to what common honesty requires of him in his relations to the Church, he says, page 34:

“As a bishop of that Church I dissent entirely from the principle laid down by some, that such a question as that which is here discussed is not even an open question for an English clergyman—that we are bound by solemn obligations to maintain certain views, on the points here involved, to our lives’ end, or, at least, to *resign* our sacred office in the Church as soon as ever we feel it impossible any longer to hold them.”

It seems to me that there is an unfair use of the word “some.” The truth would have prompted the use of “the Church.” The question is simply whether a man ought to be loyal

to a Government which protects and feeds him, when through her salaries he lives. The trespass is not in thinking as he does, but in continuing to use the money and honors of the Church, to multiply his strength with which to desolate the Church.

I have presented these points, simply to get at the real nature of the work before us, so far as it is related to its Right Reverend author. I am aware that his personal character does not enter into the calculation, and I have presented these statements of fact simply to exclude from the discussion any unfair difference to his views on account of his position.

The argument under (3) is introduced there because the assertion at which it is aimed does not properly belong to Colenso's argument at all, and is thrown in by him to leave him still in the fold of faith. He wishes to be heard as a saint and a martyr, and I think it more honest to hear him in his true character. Not till a thorough examination of the work, and a careful weighing

of the argument proved to my own mind, at least, that the Pentateuch is historical, have I ventured to present Colenso's character so nakedly. If the argument for the points does not sustain the positions, I am willing to bear the charge of uncharitableness.

CHAPTER III.

THE BEARINGS OF COLENZO'S VIEWS UPON THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

SUCH is the relation existing between the Pentateuch and the New Testament, that every thoughtful man feels that they must either stand or fall together. Colenso says that some *simple*, faithful, believing souls will be pained, because they regard the two Testaments as inseparable; and he consoles them, or tries to let their faith down easily to infidelity, by simply affirming that "it is *not* so." To this I would beg leave modestly to answer, that "it *is* so." Now the argument is even; so let us look at the evidences of this:

Take away the Pentateuch, and Christ is simply jugged into the world without any relations to it. He is in just the wrong place. If the story contained in the Pentateuch is not true,

the whole system of Judaism falls into ruin, and every system growing out of it, and dependent upon it as a basis, must also fall. If there was no night of the Passover, what was the meaning of the Paschal Lamb? If it had no meaning, how could it acquire any meaning by being transferred to Jesus? What could the great sacrifice mean to a people who had never felt the need of a sacrifice? To him who studies the slow process by which new and foreign ideas acquire force, there is an imperative necessity for long-continued processes of education. If there had been no Law, no schoolmaster to lead the race to Christ, they never could have come to him. Take away the first, and you utterly defeat the second. The great idea of the Gospel is not a native of this world—it came from the worlds above us; and, as a consequence, it required long training, fifteen hundred years of hard schooling, to give any meaning to the word *mercy*.

There is another law in the nature of things which makes the order established in the Bible

indispensable. There comes always training before skill, obedience before power to govern, submission before dominion, the restraints of childhood before the liberty of manhood, the Law before the Gospel, Moses before Christ. The Mosaic dispensation might, perhaps, have been supplanted by some other equivalent system. But either that or its equal must necessarily have preceded the Christian dispensation. So that, looked at simply in the light of reason, the destruction of the first is the inevitable destruction of the other. If Colenso can show that the *harvest* is in no way related to the sowing, then he can, perhaps, show that the New Testament is in no way related to the Pentateuch.

But there is still another class of evidence showing this inseparable connection between Moses and Christ. It is this: Christ and the apostles defended and established the Messiahship of Jesus by appeals to Moses. When Jesus appeared to Cleopas and his companions, as they

journeyed from Jerusalem to Emmaus, he reproached them with their lack of faith, and sustained his charge by appeals to the Old Testament: "And beginning at MOSES, and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." (Luke xxiv, 27.) Again, we read: "For had ye believed *Moses*, ye would have believed ME: for *he* wrote of *me*. But if ye believe not HIS *writings*, how shall ye believe MY words?" (John v, 46, 47.) Jesus declares that a belief in Moses and in Moses' writings was essential to a belief in himself, and states the proposition doubly. If they believed one they would believe the other; and if they did not believe the one they could not believe the other. One would think that this single passage would have convinced even Colenso that, to destroy our faith in Moses would necessarily destroy our faith in Christ. One might almost think that Paul, the great missionary Bishop, had in his mind's eye this modern missionary Bishop, when he wrote, "But even unto

this day, when Moses is read the vail is upon their heart." Yet even Colenso needs not despair, for, "nevertheless, when it shall turn to the Lord, the vail shall be taken away."

Again we read, (Acts xxviii, 23,) when Paul was at Rome, "And when they had appointed him a day, there came many to him into his lodging, to whom he expounded and testified [sustained by evidence] the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the *law* of Moses, and out of the prophets, from morning till evening." Again, (Hebrews iii, 5 :) "And Moses *verily* was *faithful* in *all* his house, as a servant, *for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after.*" Colenso says Moses was not faithful; Paul says Moses was faithful. Whom will ye believe? If ye believe Colenso, you not only destroy the ground of trust in Christ, but also the veracity of Paul.

And Peter says of Moses, (Acts iii, 21, 22,) "Which God hath spoken by the mouth of all *his holy* prophets, since the world began. For

Moses truly said unto the fathers, A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you," etc. Peter, under the inspiration of the Pentecostal baptism, said Moses, as one of *God's holy* prophets, "spake truly!" What will Colenso do with Peter? Surely he furnishes an example of wonderful credulity—believing a Zulu native rather than Christ, and Paul, and Peter! He does feel the embarrassment of the Savior's faith in Moses, and attempts to charge that faith to ignorance. The argument amounts to this: Though Christ at twelve years of age was more than equal to the doctors in the Temple, yet even after his resurrection (Acts xxiv, 27) he could not be supposed to know as much about Moses as the Bishop of Natal.

Here is his argument, (pp. 30, 31, and 32;) I will give it in full:

"On one point, however, it may be well to make here a few observations. There may be some who will say that such words as those in John v, 46, 47, 'For had ye believed Moses,

ye would have believed me: for *he wrote* of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?' or in Luke xx, 37—'Now that the dead are raised, even *Moses shewed* at the bush, [that is, in the passage about the 'bush,'] when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob;' or in Luke xvi, 29—'*They have Moses* and the prophets; let them hear them,' and v. 31, '*If they hear not Moses* and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead,'—are at once decisive upon the point of Moses' authorship of the Pentateuch, since they imply that our Lord himself believed in it, and, consequently, to assert that Moses did *not* write these books, would be to contradict the words of Christ, and to impugn his veracity.

"To make use of such an argument is, indeed, to bring the sacred ark itself into the battlefield, and to make belief in Christianity itself depend entirely upon the question whether Moses

wrote the Pentateuch or not. There is, however, no force in this particular objection, as will appear from the following considerations :

“(1.) First, such words as the above, if understood in their most literal sense, can only be supposed, at all events, to apply to *certain parts* of the Pentateuch ; since most devout Christians will admit that the last chapter of Deuteronomy, which records the death of Moses, could not have been written by his hand, and the most orthodox commentators are obliged also to concede the probability of *some* other interpolations having been made in the original story. It would become, therefore, even thus, a question for a reverent criticism to determine what passages give signs of *not* having been written by Moses.

“(2.) But, secondly, and more generally, it may be said that, in making use of such expressions, our Lord did but accommodate his words to the current popular language of the day, as when he speaks of God ‘making his sun to rise,’ (Matt. v, 45,) or of the ‘stars falling from heav-

en,' (Matt. xxiv, 29,) or of Lazarus being 'carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom,' (Luke xvi, 22,) or of the woman 'with a spirit of infirmity,' whom 'Satan had bound eighteen years,' (Luke xiii, 16, etc.,) without our being at all authorized in drawing from them scientific or psychological conclusions.

"(3.) Lastly, it is perfectly consistent with the most entire and sincere belief in our Lord's divinity, to hold, as many do, that when he vouchsafed to become a 'son of man,' he took our nature fully, and voluntarily entered into all the conditions of humanity, and, among others, into that which makes our growth in all ordinary knowledge *gradual* and *limited*. We are expressly told in Luke ii, 52, that Jesus increased in *wisdom*, as well as in stature. It is not supposed that in his human nature he was acquainted, more than any *educated* Jew of the age, with the mysteries of all modern sciences; nor, with St. Luke's expressions before us, can it be seriously maintained that, as an *infant*, or young

child, he possessed a knowledge surpassing that of the most pious and learned adults of his nation upon the subject of the authorship and age of the different portions of the Pentateuch. At what period, then, of his life upon earth is it to be supposed that he had granted to him as the Son of man *supernaturally* full and accurate information on these points, so that he should be expected to speak about the Pentateuch in other terms than any other devout Jew of that day would have employed? Why should it be thought that he would speak with certain *Divine* knowledge on this matter, more than upon other matters of ordinary science or history?"

Colenso fairly states the argument, and then attempts to answer it. Let us look at his reasoning. In the first place he attempts to drive us from the true issue by saying, "To make use of such an argument is, indeed, to bring the sacred ark itself into the battle-field, and to make a belief in Christianity itself depend entirely upon the question whether Moses wrote the

Pentateuch or not?" Let us pass over his *curious temerity* concerning "the sacred ark," though he is trying to shatter it into a thousand pieces, with his mathematical siege guns, and see if this exposure of the sacred ark is not just the thing that Christ thrusts upon those who reject Moses. (John v, 46, 47 :) "Had ye believed *Moses*, ye would have believed *me*. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe *my words*?" I leave the issue between Christ and Colenso.

His first answer is this—that these words imply only a belief that Moses wrote *certain parts* of the Pentateuch, and can not refer to all of it. Devout criticism will admit that the last chapter of Deuteronomy, and a few passages supposed to be interpolated, were not written by Moses; therefore, he concludes there is no conflict between Christ and Colenso. Here, by "*certain parts*," he introduces the fallacy of *ambiguous middle*; for Christ assures the truthfulness of Moses in all the essential parts; that

is, in the story out of which Judaism sprang, and without which Judaism would have been impossible. But Colenso aims his argument at this very story, and, in *this* argument, dodges the true issue because he finds one chapter, and that not claiming to be written by Moses—but appropriately appended to his work—one chapter out of 187 that Moses did not write. Is this logic worthy of a man who claims to know more than all who have lived before him? In this volume Colenso says, (p. 53,) “We have no alternative but to conclude that the MAIN PORTIONS of the story of the Exodus are *certainly not* to be regarded as *historically true*.” And in his Second Part he labors to show that Moses wrote but little, if any, of the story. Is this in keeping with the view which the Jews held of Moses and the Pentateuch, which Christ also affirmed and established? Christ does not say if ye believe not *minor parts* of Moses’ writings, but if ye believe not *his writings*. Colenso’s fallacy is too bold to need further comment.

The second grand argument is that Christ did *but* accommodate his words to the popular language. Why did not Colenso think of this when he was quibbling about "God's calling the Israelites to meet at the door of the tabernacle?" It would not serve him there. Here, as applied, it means simply this: the story of the Pentateuch is false; and yet Christ, who was the Truth itself, indorsed that story. Moses did not write it; yet Christ says he did. This is *simply* accommodating his words to popular language. O, blasphemy! didst thou ever wear a milder form?

Feeling that this is too bold, Colenso comes up on the other side, claiming that Christ did not know any better. But the disciples said, "Now we are sure that thou knowest all things," and after this, and after his resurrection, Jesus reaffirms the authority of Moses. (Luke xxiv, 27.) The charge of ignorance fares no better in the light of the Scriptures than does the charge of falsehood. There remains no escape.

If the Pentateuch falls, the whole plan of redemption fails, Christ is an impostor, and we are left orphaned in the world, with no hope but death.

CHAPTER IV.

THE REAL QUESTION BEFORE US.

THE truth and inspiration of the Pentateuch is *not* a question to be decided by a *balance* of *probabilities*; but, so far forth as Colenso's book is concerned, it is a question of *possibilities*. Probabilities may go far to confirm it, but can have no weight against it. If it is consistent throughout, that creates a strong probability of its truth. If it is *contradictory* and *impossible* in itself, that is demonstration that it is not true. And any sufficient evidence that it is impossible to be true, removes it from any claim to inspiration, or to Divine authority. The question is not one of *probabilities*, but one of *possibilities*. Understand this clearly. An objection, to be valid, that is, proving the Pentateuch false, must contain an IMPOSSIBILITY. Otherwise it *may* be

true, that is, it is possibly true, and through that possibility Christ may lead humanity up to God. Colenso admits this, as every man whose common-sense gives him a right to reason must admit, (page 52,) where he condemns the Pentateuch on account of the "many absolute impossibilities involved."

What we have to do, then, is to take the Pentateuch as it is, with its genealogies and its figures, and show that they *do not* involve any *impossibilities*.

To concede that there is required a new construction of the Hebrew numerals, is to concede that as it now stands it is not true. This, I think, is the point at issue. If there existed such a demand I think the collateral evidence is sufficient to justify the belief that it would be met, so that all the *essentials* of salvation would remain; but from a careful study of the figures, as they are, there appears to be no such demand. Occasional error may appear from the carelessness of transcribers, but this could not run

through the entire story. I accept what is termed "the higher numbers," that is, the account as it is, for the following reasons: 1. They are so clearly stated and so often repeated. 2. The purpose for which they were taken required exactness. 3. The accuracy of the multiplications and additions, the sum equaling all the parts, while from all the figuring of Herodotus there are but one or two correct results where the numbers were high. 4. Only these large numbers, or larger ones, would verify the story. 5. As we shall see, they involved no *impossibility*.

Let this be remembered, that the Pentateuch is the oldest book extant, was prepared among an ignorant, bigoted people, and is the history of a nation *for twenty-five centuries*, though not more than one-fourth the size of the account of *one man's* "travels in Africa" for *half that many years*. Consequently, whole centuries are to be summed up in a few paragraphs. Omissions there must be. Many results would necessarily

be noticed, whose causes are left unnoticed. Indeed, if it were otherwise, and all the biographies were given, it would be a hundred-fold larger than the Cyclopaedia Britannica. All the argument requires is this, that it *contains no impossibilities*.

In this review, which *shall be all that it claims to be*, reader, you must not expect strokes of rhetoric or flights of fancy. You will find only the conclusions of a plain matter-of-fact discussion of a plain matter-of-fact subject, and you are invited to scrutinize the evidence and sift the logic. If the *seeming* or *manufactured* difficulties are removed, reject them. If not, wait patiently till some *thinker* and *scholar* has combated them. This fix in your faith, that God's Word *will stand*—the mountains may flee away, but *not one jot or one tittle* of God's Word shall fail. His *truth* is *not* an infant cradled in the lap of human credulity, but it is a giant leaping out of heaven into the world, *full armed*, demanding universal submission. For one, I

have not attached myself to the truth to conceal its weaknesses, to patch up its wounds, to cover its retreat, or to give it a decent burial, but I have attached myself to the truth to save my soul, to be carried in its strong arms through this world, error, and conflict up to God.

CHAPTER V.

THE QUESTION OF INSPIRATION.

“ALL Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for *instruction in righteousness*; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished *unto all good works*.” (2 Tim. iii, 16, 17.) This is the teaching of the book itself, and contains the belief of Christians on this subject. To demand any thing more than this, and then to condemn the whole book because it does not furnish it, is to create a false issue. It is simply fighting a man of straw.

It claims to be profitable “for instruction in righteousness.” Colenso, overlooking this point, demands that the book shall teach him all sciences in scientific language, which it does not do, and from the nature of the case *could not do*. Lan-

guage is not permanent. It advances or declines as the people speaking it advance or decline. Words that were the chief stock in conversation of one age, fall into disuse, and drop out of the language. New words come in to represent the new ideas of the people. Till Colenso can demonstrate two things—first, that language was perfect in the beginning, and, second, that mind never varies in its development—he has no right to expect any book to be written in the peculiar style of all ages. Before it could incorporate the *technical* terms of any science it would require a *people acquainted* with that science. But as the Bible has to do with righteousness and not with science, it is to be measured by the demand on that basis. If its inspiration meets that demand, we are to receive it as inspired, though it does not deal with the abstract terms which are always additions to a language.

Though it comes FROM a *Perfect Mind, the All-Knowing One*, and has therefore the *ma-*

terials enabling it to make perfect revelations of truth, yet it comes to poor, little, finite minds, which can not receive many deep things, and which, consequently, limit the revelation of the truth; and it comes THROUGH the media of the stammering, haltering jargons of this world, which can receive into their broken sentences but little of those wonderful truths which fill and overflow the language of God and heaven.

Missionaries say that one of the most difficult things to overcome in translating from a nobler into a meaner language, is to find words which will express the ideas of the first in the second. If there is that difficulty between the English and the Fiji, what must it be between the Divine and the human? As a consequence, many truths are only *partially* revealed—many are only so much revealed that they need the light of other truths, and the expositions of ages, to bring them out into shape. A castle on the side of a mountain, seen in the dim twilight, appears only as a shapeless shadow, deepening the darkness

behind it. But as the day advances it comes out clearer and more distinct, till at last the risen sun, reflected from polished shaft, and turret, and dome, reveals a masterpiece of architecture with carved work and fretted cornice. To deny its beauty, and declare that it never came from the hand of an architect, when the broad daylight is demonstrating the beauty of the conception and the skill of the execution, because the darkness obscured its proportions and perfection in the early twilight, would be to exhibit the folly and unfairness of the critic.

So, now, in the meridian splendor of a perfected revelation, to condemn as false the entire system of inspiration, because, when the race was in the twilight of its knowledge, God's revelation was not entire—that is, did not bring out *every* part of all its truths—is an error no more excusable.

God might have so inspired his prophets and teachers that they could have declared the most subtle truths of science, and the most abstract

deductions concerning his mysterious nature, but such a revelation would have been self-defeating. The men to whom it was declared would have known no more about it after the utterances than they did before. Colenso might have stood up in the streets of Pietermaritzburg, the capital of Natal, and declared, in the most approved English, that "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life," and the Zulus might have thought the sounds flowed off pleasantly, but they would not have received the truth. Before they could understand the truth Colenso must translate it into their language. So God might have declared his wonderful truths in full, might have pronounced all their hidden relations as they stood out in his own thought, but that would not have made Adam, or Moses, or Bacon, or Colenso any wiser. The truth must be translated, and then these worthies could understand some of it. This is just what God has been

doing. He revealed his will as rapidly as the race could receive it, till, "in the fullness of time," he completed the revelation in the person of Jesus of Nazareth.

CHAPTER VI.

DIFFICULTIES IN COLENSO'S "INTRODUCTORY
REMARKS."

THE first mentioned, in a list of others, is the account of the creation. Though no argument is presented to support a difficulty at this point, and though the difficulty itself is not even stated, yet a few words may not be amiss here. The whole catalogue given (pages 49 and 50) is not sustained in the least, and seems to be thrown in just to create a suspicion against the Bible in a field where argument can not be brought against it. It reminds one of the pious slander which some people, too conscientious to put a falsehood about a neighbor into words, and yet wishing to darken the neighbor's character, start on its mission of wrong by significant nods and knowing looks.

I will give only a few facts presented by geology, supporting the account given in Genesis. I quote from one of our ablest geologists—Edward Hitchcock, D. D., LL. D.

1. The Scriptures and geology agree in *not* fixing the time of the creation of the world.

2. They do fix the time when man appeared.

3. They represent creation as the work of God.

4. They represent instrumentalities as employed in the work of creation.

5. They represent creation to be a *progressive* work, completed by successive exhibitions of Divine power, with intervals of repose.

6. They represent the continents as covered an indefinite period by the ocean, and subsequently elevated above it.

7. They give the earth a very early revolution on its axis.

8. Genesis allows us to suppose an indefinite period between "the beginning" and the first day.

9. We *may* understand the days as *symbolically representing* indefinite periods.

10. Genesis *may* be regarded as a succession of pictures with *existing nature* on the foreground, *not* representing *all the* changes, but the most prominent scenes in creation.

11. Genesis could not give the true chronological order of events, taking *existing nature* as the foreground, because often the same class is *several times repeated*.

12. Genesis and geology represent physical evil as in the world before man.

It is sufficient to know that the ablest geologists clearly *show* the perfect agreement between Genesis and geology.

The second difficulty presented by Colenso is the Deluge. In his Preface, p. 6: "While translating the story of the Flood a simple-minded native asked me, 'Is all that true?' . . . I dared not say so. My own knowledge of geology had been much increased since I left England, and I now know for *certain*, on geological grounds, a fact of which I had only had misgivings before; namely, that a *universal deluge*,

such as the Bible *manifestly* speaks of, could not possibly have taken place in the way described in the Book of Genesis. I refer especially to the circumstance, well known to all geologists, that volcanic hills exist of immense extent in Auvergne and Languedoc, which must have been formed ages before the Noachian Deluge, and which are covered with light and loose substances, that must have been swept away by a flood, but do not exhibit the slightest sign of having ever been so disturbed.”

I would simply ask where the *must* have been swept away comes from? That they *might* have been swept away we can easily see, but not that they *must*. Till this is fixed this objection is powerless.

He adds that “some have attempted to show that Noah’s Deluge was only a *partial one*. But such attempts have ever seemed to me to be made in the very teeth of Scripture statements. Nor is any thing gained by it. For as waters must find their level on the earth’s surface,

without a special miracle, of which the Bible says nothing, a flood which should begin by covering the top of Ararat, must necessarily become universal."

In the first place he assumes that the Flood was *not* a miracle. Could not God cause the water to overflow one territory and restrain it from other territories, as easily as he could move it one inch from its accustomed bed? Who shall prescribe limits to the exercise of omnipotence?

Another unwarrantable assumption is this: that God could not cause the depression of a continent. Geology says he not only *can*, but absolutely *has* done so.

Another unwarrantable assumption is this: that the Bible necessarily teaches a universal Flood. We do find that in many places *universal* terms are used where only a part is meant. (See Gen. xli, 57.) "And *all* countries came into Egypt to Joseph, for to buy corn, because the famine was so sore in *all* lands." We

do not for a moment think that it is intended here that all the people of Europe, and Asia, and Africa, to say nothing of America, which may have been inhabited, went to Egypt to buy corn. Yet the expression, taken literally, is as plain as it can be that *all countries* came from *all lands*. This is more positive in its universality than any expression in reference to the Flood. If one is admitted to be used for a part or for many, why not the other also?

Again, (Exodus ix, 25:) "And the hail smote throughout *all the* land of Egypt *all* that was in the field, both man and beast, and the hail smote EVERY herb of the field, and brake *every tree* of the field." But at x, 15, we read that the locusts "did eat every herb of the land and all the fruit of the trees which the HAIL HAD LEFT." Here is a positive limitation to a general term. Why are we compelled to stretch less general terms in reference to the Flood? Again, (Acts ii, 5:) "And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of *every*

nation under heaven." Yet in the list that follows the *world* is not summed up. Verse 10 says, "And in *the parts* of Lybia about Cyrene," clearly leaving other parts of Lybia out of the account. Why take this same expression and stretch it over all the world, in the case of the Flood, and not so extend it here? Once more, (Col. i, 23,) speaking of the Gospel, "which was preached to *every creature which is under heaven.*" I will not multiply passages. It must be clear that the Scriptures *do not necessarily teach a universal deluge.* There was no demand for a flood to reach further than over the *then* inhabited portions of the world; and it is not God's plan to expend power vainly or foolishly. If Colenso had brought to his aid honest interpretation, and a fair amount of knowledge, he need not have been drowned out by the Zulu's questions.

Another difficulty Colenso gathers from grouping together a number of miracles; namely, The sun and moon standing still; the waters of the

River Jordan standing in heaps as solid walls, while the stream we must suppose was still running—why *must* we suppose it?—the ass speaking with human voice, etc.

The question here raised is simply one of the possibility of miracles. To put it fairly: Can He who created and constantly keeps in motion the world control its laws? I can lift my hand, which is contrary to Nature's great law of gravity. Now, can God do what I can, work in spite of a natural law? I can communicate my ideas. Can God do the same?—can he tell man what he wishes to communicate? Rightly looked at the question of miracles is very simple and very short. The Bishop seems to feel this; for he says, (page 51:) "I could believe and receive the miracles of Scripture heartily, if only they were authenticated by a veracious history." If, then, he could believe and receive miracles, authenticated by veracious history, it is neither logical nor fair to bring forward miracles as evidence that the history is not veracious.

The *size* of the miracles can not come into the account, because in the hands of God all bodies are equally light. It is no more difficult to arrest the world on its axis, and all systems with it if need be, than to put the world on its axis in the first place, and start the universe in its thousand motions. All Colenso's doubts and darkness about miracles is but an unfair storm of dust, stirred up to blind his unsuspecting readers, and cover their eyes while he leads them into the camp of their enemies.

If Colenso will stand by the tomb at Bethany, and see Jesus, by the mere utterance of a few words, call up one from the iron kingdom of death, upon whose body corruption had been feasting for four days, and then remember that the same God who raised Lazarus undertook the deliverance of the Hebrews from Egypt, he will not find it difficult to believe that the waters of the Red Sea obeyed the command of the Almighty. Where God interposes a miracle, reasoning is nonsense.

Another point which greatly "strained" Colenso's faith in the historical veracity of the Pentateuch was the commands concerning slavery. Read what he says, (pp. 50 and 51:)

"'If the master [of a Hebrew servant] have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons and daughters, *the wife and her children shall be her master's*, and he shall go out free by himself,' (Ex. xxi, 4,) the wife and children in such a case being placed under the protection of such other words as these: 'If a man smite his servant, or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall be surely punished. *Notwithstanding*, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished: for *he is his money*.' (Ex. xxi, 21, 22.)

"I shall never forget the revulsion of feeling with which a very intelligent Christian native, with whose help I was translating these words into the Zulu tongue, first heard them as words said to be uttered by the same Great and Gracious Being whom I was teaching him to trust in and adore. His whole soul revolted

against the notion, that the Great and Blessed God, the Merciful Father of all mankind, would speak of a servant or maid as mere 'money,' and allow a horrible crime to go unpunished, because the victim of the brutal usage had survived a few hours. My own heart and conscience at the time fully sympathized with his. But I then clung to the notion, that the main substance of the narrative was historically true. And I relieved his difficulty and my own for the present by telling him that I supposed that such words as these were written down by Moses, and believed by him to have been divinely given to him, because the thought of them arose in his heart, as he conceived, by the inspiration of God, and that hence to all such laws he prefixed the formula, 'Jehovah said unto Moses,' without it being on that account necessary for us to suppose that they were actually spoken by the Almighty. This was, however, a very great strain upon the cord, which bound me to the ordinary belief in the historical veracity of the Penta-

teuch; and since then that cord has snapped in twain altogether."

Here are two or three points worthy of notice, and worthy of Bishop Colenso: 1. God does not call a servant or maid "*mere*" money. A man's wife or daughter may be his cook, and still not be a "*mere*" cook. 2. His exposition to the native is most shallow. If Moses had strength of mind enough to make him leader of that immense multitude, he certainly must have known enough to distinguish between what he thought himself and what the Lord told him. 3. Colenso ought to have known that the new law for servants was *very much milder* and better than any law that class had ever had before. Instead of being so terrible it was really a *great reform*.

The race was, comparatively, in its infancy. It could not be led in a week, or a year, or a generation, up to the summit of moral development. It would be just as reasonable to condemn the mother for cooing and prattling

her heart's story into her infant's ear and soul, rather than talk to it of the infinite, the absolute, and the unconditioned, as it is to condemn God's mode of teaching humanity. A simple statement of the truth as it is would have saved Colenso from his foolish quibble, and left the Word of God in the native's mind with full force, undimmed by doubt. Dishonesty always darkens counsel.

CHAPTER VII.

THE FAMILY OF JUDAH.

AFTER running the changes on a few objections which he does not even state, and does not attempt to sustain, giving them the color of his broad assumption, that his argument in the body of the work has utterly annihilated even the possibility of the Pentateuch's being true, Colenso at last, after spending more than one-fourth of his book in preparatory assumptions, enters upon his holy calling at page 60, with a chapter entitled "The Family of Judah."

Here is his argument:

"Now Judah was *forty-two* years old, according to the story, when he went down with Jacob into Egypt. But, if we turn to Gen. xxxviii, we shall find that in the course of these forty-

two years of Judah's life, the following events are recorded to have happened.

“(1.) Judah grows up, marries a wife—‘at that time,’ (v. 1,) that is, after Joseph’s being sold into Egypt, when he was ‘seventeen years old,’ (Gen. xxxvii, 2,) and when Judah, consequently, was *twenty* years old—and has, separately, three sons by her.

“(2.) The eldest of these three sons grows up, is married, and dies.

“The second grows up—suppose in another year—marries his brother’s widow, and dies.

“The third grows to maturity—suppose in another year still—but declines to take his brother’s widow to wife.

“She then deceives Judah himself, conceives by him, and in due time bears him twins, Pharez and Zarah.

“(3.) One of these twins also grows to maturity, and has two sons, Hezron and Hamul, born to him, before Jacob goes down into Egypt.”

From this Colenso concludes that either the account in Exodus of Jacob's family, or the account in Genesis of Judah's life, must be false. And consequently the *Pentateuch is unhistorical*.

Let us examine the premises and the conclusion before we charge deception upon Christ, who appealed so often to Moses.

In the first place, *Judah was forty-five, and may have been forty-six years old, instead of forty-two, when Jacob went down into Egypt* For, "according to the story," Judah was the fourth son from one wife of Jacob's double marriage, (Gen. xxix,) which *may* have been at the beginning of the *fourth year*, instead of at the end, and Joseph was born at the end of the *seventh year*; so that Judah *may have been* four years older than Joseph. Joseph was thirty when he stood before Pharaoh. Allowing nothing for the time that *may* have elapsed between Joseph's interpretation of Pharaoh's dreams and the commencement of the years of plenty, there

were nine years more before Judah stood before Joseph, and then, as Colenso admits, (page 70,) nearly two years more were consumed in the journeys between Canaan to Egypt, and in being starved out the second time. Therefore, Joseph may have been forty-one or forty-two, consequently Judah forty-five or forty-six.

Secondly, it is *not* certain, "from the story," that Judah was twenty when he married. 1. The reference "*at that time*," (Gen. xxxviii, 1,) may not necessarily refer to the things specified in Gen. xxxvii; but, as Ainsworth remarks, may more properly refer to some period "soon after Jacob's coming to Shechem, (Gen. xxxiii, 18,) before the history of Dinah, (Gen. xxxiv.)" Dr. Clarke prefers to think "that chap. xxxviii originally followed chap. xxxiii, and that it got by accident into this place." This view, I think, is rendered very probable by the fact that where it now stands it is an abrupt introduction of a new subject into the midst of Joseph's history; chap. xxxvii ends with Joseph's sale, and chap.

xxxix, commences where chap. xxxvii leaves off, the history of Judah having no connection or relation to either part. Furthermore, chap. xxxviii would naturally follow chap. xxxiii, and be followed by chap. xxxiv, because Dinah's life would naturally be given in connection with Judah's. Whatever the original arrangement may have been, this is certain to the careful, thoughtful reader, that the subject of chap. xxxviii comes in between the subjects of chaps. xxxiii and xxxiv, and not in the middle of Joseph's history. Again, as Bishop Colenso, or any scholar such as he *claims* to be, may see by looking at the Hebrew text, that the expression "Baeth-hahee," "*at that time*," (Gen. xxxviii, 1,) is more properly translated "*in that time*," and consequently Judah's marriage may be located any where in the preceding history—after he came to Shalem with his father, who there bought a piece of land, spread his tent and erected an altar, (Gen. xxxiii, 19, 20.)

We now have forty-five or forty-six years for

the accomplishment of the events of Judah's life up to the going down into Egypt, and the question is very simple—Was it POSSIBLE for him to have great grandchildren in the time? It must be remembered that upon him as well as upon all the Israelites rested the especial blessing of God in reference to fruitfulness. We must calculate *possibilities* under this special blessing, and not the ordinary course of things in English society.

A few facts will settle this question. The average age of puberty in the Hindoo female is thirteen years; and Mr. Robertson, who is underwritten by Dr. Carpenter, (*Cyclopedia of Anatomy and Physiology*, vol. iv, pp. 1339, 1340,) cites cases as young as 8, others at 9, and many at 10, etc. The average age of puberty of the English female is $14\frac{1}{2}$ years. Robertson also cites cases at 9, and very many at 10. The average age of puberty of males is a little less than 15, or about the same as that of English females. Now, as the term *av-*

erage implies, and as the facts with females show, we may reasonably expect some cases as early as 10 or 11. There is nothing impossible about it. But we do not need this. There is time enough without it. Now, allowing 2 years, all that even Colenso asks, for the maturing of Judah's 2d and 3d sons, after the death of the 1st, and we have left 43 or 44 years for the three generations, that is, 14 years and 4 or 8 months each, the average age of puberty of males.

Is it not clear that Hezron and Hamul *may have* been born in Canaan? and if that is *barely possible* the leading favorite objection of Colenso loses its force, and falls utterly worthless. Instead of the thing being *impossible*, which is necessary to make the objection valid, it might all have happened inside of thirty-six years; so that we have ten years to spare. That is more than time enough for a Zulu native to "out-figure" and convert a celebrated mathematical bishop. Colenso says that the Pentateuch is

unhistorical, because Hezron and Hamul *could not* have been born in the time allowed. If they *could have been born*, then this objection is worthless, and the "figures and facts" clearly show that Hezron and Hamul could have been born in Canaan. Therefore, so far as Judah's family is concerned, the Pentateuch remains "*historical*."

Mahan gives another exposition, conceding that Hezron and Hamul were not born in Canaan; and as it is a fair meeting of the question by a hypothesis, clearly admissible, I will give its substance:

Jacob's family list was made out after the descent. The number was seventy, *a sacred number*. Of these, *four* had died in Canaan, and, therefore, *four* grandchildren were substituted to keep the *sacred number good*—two for Er and Onan, and two for Jacob's two wives, which were all Jacob had, though Colenso tries to conceal this fact, by speaking of Leah "and the other *wives* of Jacob." There having died

but *four*, only *four* were needed, from all the grandchildren which Jacob may have had, to complete the list. The above hypothesis is *reasonable*, and before it Colenso's objection falls.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE SIZE OF THE COURT OF THE TABERNACLE
COMPARED WITH THE NUMBER OF THE
CONGREGATION.

HIS argument is this: Moses, by the command of Jehovah, gathered the congregation together *unto* the door of the tabernacle. By a learned calculation, the Bishop *figures* up a result that the court would not contain one one-hundredth of the adult males, and, therefore, it is inconceivable that the multitude should be thus summoned by the command of Almighty God, (page 80,) and therefore the Pentateuch is unhistorical.

Read his summation on page 80:

“But how many would the *whole court* have contained? Its area—60 yards by 30 yards—was 1,800 square yards, and the area of the tabernacle itself—18 yards by 6 yards—was

108 square yards. Hence the area of the court outside the tabernacle was 1,692 square yards. But the 'whole congregation' would have made a body of people nearly 20 miles—or, more accurately, 33,530 yards—long, and 18 feet—or 6 yards—wide; that is to say, packed closely together, they would have covered an area of 201,180 square yards. In fact, the court, when thronged, could only have held 5,000 people; whereas the able-bodied men alone exceeded 600,000. Even the ministering Levites, 'from thirty to fifty years old,' were 8,580 in number, (Num. iv, 48;) only 504 of these could have stood within the court in front of the tabernacle, and not two-thirds of them could have entered the court, if they had filled it from one end to the other. It is inconceivable how, under such circumstances, 'all the assembly,' the 'whole congregation,' could have been summoned to attend 'at the door of the tabernacle,' by the express command of Almighty God."

That the whole congregation could have stood

in the court at the same time no body ever claimed. The application of the principle of interpretation insisted on by Colenso, (page 31,) "that our Lord conformed to the current, popular language of the day," removes the whole difficulty. If Christ did, why could not Moses? Mark this. The fallacy in the application of this principle, at page 31, is this: Christ did not adopt merely the language of the day, but the *ideas*, and *beliefs*, and DOCTRINES of the people. The fallacy in rejecting the application here is because Moses *did adopt* the current, popular LANGUAGE and IDIOMS of the day.

This denial of idioms common to all languages, and perfectly understood, is so childish that it is difficult to treat it soberly. Let us treat it candidly, and apply his own mathematics, remembering that some things are so plainly absurd that they can not be reasoned against, because you can not *increase* their absurdity.

It is a law of logic that an argument that proves too much is not sound. An infinite

quantity is a quantity greater than any assignable quantity, and "it is inconceivable" that any calculations in which such a quantity is used are exact calculations. But such a quantity is used in mathematical calculations. Therefore "it is inconceivable" that mathematical calculations are exact. The Bishop forbids that any language should contain symbols of thought not exact, and therefore there are no symbols of thought not exact, his own mathematical books to the contrary.

Again: Colenso has written a book trying to prove that the Pentateuch is not true. But Colenso is a Bishop of the Church of England, and, as such, has given his word of honor before God, a most solemn oath, that he does believe the Pentateuch is true. Therefore it is inconceivable that Colenso ever wrote a book trying to prove that the Pentateuch is not true.

Abraham Lincoln, as President of the United States, issued an order that *all* the people should fast one day and pray the blessing of God upon

our cause. But not more than one in six ever prays. Therefore it is inconceivable that Mr. Lincoln ever issued such an order. Such conclusions get their viciousness from the unwarrantable assumptions of their premises.

CHAPTER IX.

MOSES AND JOSHUA ADDRESSING ALL ISRAEL.

IN Chapter V Colenso enters upon a labored argument to show that this was impossible. It may seem a waste of time and space to criticise such an objection; yet, as it shows the desperateness of the infidel's case, I will present his argument, taken from pages 81 and 83:

“‘These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel.’ (Deut. i, 1.)

“‘And Moses called Israel, and said unto them.’ (Deut. v, i.)

“‘And afterward he read all the words of the law, the blessings and the cursings, according to all that which is written in the book of the law. There was not a word of all that Moses commanded, which Joshua read not before all the congregation of Israel, with the women, and

the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them.' (Josh. viii, 34, 35.)

"We have just seen that the men in the prime of life, 'above twenty years of age,' (Num. i, 3,) were more than 600,000 in number. We may reckon that the women in the prime of life were about as many; the males under twenty years, 300,000; the females under twenty years, 300,000; and the old people, male and female together, 200,000, making the whole number about two millions. This number, which Kurtz adopts, (iii, p. 149,) is, indeed, a very moderate estimate. In Horne's *Introd.* iii, p. 205, they are reckoned to have formed 'an aggregate of upward of three millions.'

"How, then, is it conceivable that a man should do what Joshua is here said to have done, unless, indeed, the reading of every 'word of all that Moses commanded,' with 'the blessings and cursings, according to all that is written in the book of the law,' was a mere dumb show, without the least idea of those most solemn

words being *heard* by those to whom they were addressed? For, surely, no human voice, unless strengthened by a miracle of which the Scripture tells us nothing, could have reached the ears of a crowded mass of people, as large as the whole population of London. The very crying of the 'little ones,' who are expressly stated to have been present, must have sufficed to drown the sounds at a few yards' distance."

I agree with Colenso, that no human voice could reach all this mass of people. And I notice that the Book does not say it did. The text quoted does not necessitate such an interpretation. Joshua viii, 33, says that Israel was collected on the sides of Mount Gerizim and Mount Ebal; and for what purpose? That the *priests*, the LEVITES, *should bless* the people of Israel. Then v. 34 says, "*afterward*" he read all the words of the law "BEFORE all the congregation of Israel;" where is the impossibility? It does not say that all heard distinctly, no more than it claims that "the little ones" com-

prehended perfectly. After this public recognition and readoption of the law of Moses, how easily could it be re-read by the Levites or by the elders! The point urged by Colenso, that they could not hear Joshua, is met very simply and very easily by a well-known and universally-admitted law of interpretation of action—*Qui facit per alium facit per se*—"What one does by another he does himself." Therefore on either hypothesis, that they did or did not hear, so far forth as Chapter V is concerned, the Pentateuch remains historical.

CHAPTER X.

THE EXTENT OF THE CAMP COMPARED WITH THE
PRIEST'S DUTIES AND THE DAILY NE-
CESSITIES OF THE PEOPLE.

HERE the argument is in three divisions :

1. Colenso opens this Chapter VI by quoting Levit. iv, 11, 12 : " And the skin of the bullock, and all his flesh, with his head, and with his legs, and his inwards, and his dung ; even the whole bullock shall he [the priest] carry forth without the camp unto a clean place, where the ashes are poured out, and burn him on the wood with fire : where the ashes are poured out there shall he be burnt."

Reckoning the population of Israel at the exodus at two millions, and allowing six feet square, or four square yards, for each person, he has a camp one and one-half miles across in

each direction, with the tabernacle in the center; therefore, the priest must carry the bullock three-fourths of a mile, which he could not do. Therefore, "the Pentateuch is unhistorical."

The answer is very simple, and *ought* to have occurred to Colenso. The Hebrew word *hotier*, translated, "he shall carry forth," is the hyphil or *causative* form of the verb; *yatsā*, "to go out," "to go forth." Being in the hyphil, its proper and almost universal translation is to *cause* to go forth—to *cause* to be done. "*Qui facit per alium facit per se.*"

2. Again, Colenso quotes Deut. xxiii, 12, 14, where the people were commanded to "go abroad" beyond the camp, which he says the sick could not do. Therefore, the "Pentateuch is unhistorical."

I find it a social law that people should "go abroad" beyond their houses, but the sick can not do this; therefore, it is inconceivable that there should be such a law. Never having been to Natal, I can not say what the social law is

there, but I know that such a social law obtains in civilized countries.

A critical examination of the passage shows this, that the command to go abroad applied only to the warriors, because they were to have a "paddle upon their weapons."

3. Again, the Bishop says they could not get fuel at Sinai for a year. This assumes that God could not supply them if it were necessary. The same objection would prove that London could not get fuel. And what would Moscow do? Facts are stubborn things.

So far forth as Chapter VI goes the Pentateuch remains *historical*.

CHAPTER XI.

THE NUMBER OF THE PEOPLE AT THE FIRST
MUSTER, COMPARED WITH THE POLL-TAX
RAISED SIX MONTHS PREVIOUSLY.

THIS is the heading of Colenso's seventh chapter. And from their agreement he tries to show its unhistorical character. He affirms that it is not reasonable that these should agree, and, therefore, he concludes that "the Pentateuch is unhistorical."

Not in keeping with his avowed desire for truth, he catches at the expression—"Shekel of the sanctuary," affirming that it "could hardly have been used in this way till there *was* a sanctuary in existence, or, rather, till the sanctuary had been some time in existence."

He says that the prose in the Septuagint version, "τὸ δίδραχμον τὸ ἅγιον," is rendered "the sa-

cred shekel." "But," he adds, "this can hardly be the true meaning of the original *Beshekel haquadesh*;" I ask, why not? If he will consult any standard authority on the Hebrew, he will find only this translation. If he had simply transcribed correctly the text from Ex. xxx, 13, he would have found a definition of the sacred shekel in the verse itself. It reads as follows: "This they shall give, every one that passeth among them, that are numbered, half a shekel, after the shekel of the sanctuary—a *shekel* is *twenty gerahs*"—etc. Now, a *gerah* was the smallest weight and coin of the Hebrews. (Gese-
nius.) It signified "a grain or a berry," which is proof that it was the simplest and *earliest* standard of calculating exchange. I would simply ask, why this omission? and refer to Rev. xxii, 19.

Let us now look at the *facts* in reference to these two numberings.

The first reference (Ex. xxx, 11, 13) simply says, "WHEN thou takest the sum of the children of Israel," etc.

The second reference (Ex. xxxviii, 25, 26) gives the silver of them that were numbered.

The third reference (Num. i, 46) the result of the *numbering*.

Now, the question comes, when were these numberings taken, on the supposition that there were two separate numberings?

We are told in Ex. xxxviii, 24, the verse preceding the account of the silver collected as poll-tax, that "all the gold that was occupied—or used—for the work in all the work," etc., was so much. The conclusion from this is this: At this time the tabernacle must have been completed, or they would not have known how much was used; consequently, the estimate of the poll-tax given in the next two verses must have been after the completion of the tabernacle. We are informed in Ex. xi, 17, that this was completed so as to be reared the first day of the first month of the second year of their escape from Egypt. And from Num. i, 18, we learn that "Moses and Aaron numbered the

children of Israel on the first day of the second month of the second year." So that there could not have been more than one month between these numberings.

The evidence seems to be largely in favor of one numbering actually gone through with among the masses of the people, and that *at* the collecting of the poll-tax, (1,) this was instituted as a matter of life and death with them. It was redemption money, that there might be no plague among them, (2.) It was accurate, or they would not have known the amount collected, (3.) Again, the numbering ordered in Numbers was *ordered* on the first day of the second month, (Num. i, 1,) and the number was taken the same day, (Num. i, 18,) and taken "by their armies," (Num. i, 3.) A man was named from each tribe to assist. This man seems to have had the "*number of the names*" of his tribe, and to have reported them. Thus, I think, "according to the story," we are led to the conclusion that the second census was only

the declaration of the facts ascertained a little while before.

If any doubt this, the fact that not more than a month intervened between these enrollments is reason enough that they should agree; and, therefore, so far as Chap. VII is concerned, "the Pentateuch is historical."

CHAPTER XII.

THE TENTS AND ARMS OF THE ISRAELITES.

IN Chapters VIII and IX Colenso constructs an argument against the Pentateuch, because tents and arms are mentioned among the scanty possessions of the Israelites. Colenso does not know where they got their tents and arms, and he concludes, therefore, "the Pentateuch is unhistorical."

Mahan asks very pertinently, "How does Bishop Colenso know that *all* the Israelites had tents? and how that these tents were made of skins?" Let Colenso show the facts before he argues from them—"And a hardy, laboring people would very naturally have arms of some kind."

CHAPTER XIII.

THE INSTITUTION OF THE PASSOVER.

IN Chapter X *brother* Colenso has found a good field for the exercise of his *gifts*, though at the expense of his *graces*. He heads his chapter with a quotation from Exodus xii, 21-28:—
“‘Then Moses called for all the elders of Israel, and said unto them, Draw out now and take you a lamb, according to your families, and kill *the passover*. And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop, and dip it in the blood that is in the basin, and strike the lintel and the two side-posts with the blood that is in the basin: and none of you shall go out at the door of his house till the morning. . . . And the children of Israel went away, and did as the Lord had commanded Moses and Aaron, so did they.’ That is to say,

in *one single day* the whole immense population of Israel, as large as that of London, was instructed to keep the Passover, and actually did keep it."

Next follows a statement of what was to be done, (pp. 106, 107:)

" 'Moses called for all the elders of Israel.' We must suppose, then, that the 'elders' lived somewhere near at hand. But where did the two millions live? And how could the order, to keep the Passover, have been conveyed, with its minutest particulars, to *each individual household* in this vast community, in one day—rather, in *twelve hours*, since Moses received the command on the very same day on which they were to kill the passover *at even*? (Ex. xii, 6.)

"It must be observed that it was absolutely necessary that the notice should be distinctly given to each separate family; for it was a matter of life and death. Upon the due performance of the Divine command it depended whether Jehovah should 'stride across,' (*pasach*.)

the threshold, (see Is. xxxi, 5,) and protect the house from the angel of death, or not. And yet the whole matter was perfectly new to them. The specific directions—about choosing the lamb, killing it at even, sprinkling its blood, and eating it, with unleavened bread, ‘not raw, nor sodden at all with water, but roast with fire,’ ‘with their loins girded, their shoes on their feet, and their staff in their hand’—were now for the first time communicated to Moses, by him to the elders, and by them to the people. These directions, therefore, could not have been conveyed by any mere *sign*, intimating that they were now to carry into execution something about which they had been informed before. They must be plainly and fully delivered to each individual head of a family, or to a number of them gathered together; though these, of course, might be ordered to assist in spreading the intelligence to others, but so that no single household should be left uninformed upon the matter.”

By a learned mathematical calculation, involv-

ing a knowledge of arithmetic as far as long division, he shows, from the number of sheep necessary to supply the paschal lambs, that the Israelites must have been scattered over "four hundred thousand acres—that is, twenty-five miles square." And from this he concludes that the thing to be done within twelve hours was impossible; therefore, "the Pentateuch is unhistorical."

Now, let us look at the foundation upon which this crushing argument rests. Colenso bases it on the expression, "this night," claiming that it must mean the night following the day on which God spoke to Moses and Aaron, and his argument rests on the Hebrew demonstrative pronoun *hazzah*, "this." Grant his definition and turn to the text, and see what it must refer to. In verse third God commands Moses to speak unto the children of Israel. The date of this conversation may have been the first day of the month, and must have been before the tenth. Moses was to speak unto Israel, to the end that

they should take a lamb on the *tenth* day, (v. 3,) and keep it till the *fourteenth* day, (v. 6,) and “Israel shall kill it in the evening, (v. 6,) and ye shall let nothing of it remain till the morning, (v. 10;) for I will pass through the land of Egypt *this* night”—that is, this night wherein Israel is eating the Passover. *Hazzah* is here used necessarily instead of *hahua*, for which Colenso pleads, because *hahua* would have referred to the *tenth* day, while the reference was clearly to the *fourteenth*.

Colenso’s argument is self-destructive, for it proves *too much*. Moses must have been a perfect fool to have ordered them to do something on the *tenth* to prepare for the *fourteenth*, and with the same breath say that it was to protect them from a plague coming before the *tenth*.

The best answer that can be given to Chapter X is a simple reading of Exodus, chapter xii. It is clear at first reading. It grows clearer at after readings. If any one will read the account given in the *chapter*, he will see that the Bishop

garbles the story; for in verse third they were told what to do on the tenth of the month, in making ready for the Passover on the fourteenth. "According to the story," they had plenty of time; according to Colenso, they had not. Choose ye which you will believe, the account given by *Moses* as it stands in the 12th of Exodus, or the account manufactured by Colenso.

I read in the American Cyclopedia that "Israel Putnam was an American General in the Revolutionary War, born January 7, 1718, died May 19, 1790." Then follows the story of his life. Now, on Colenso's new style of criticism, I can not believe that such a man as Putnam ever lived, because the account of his life does not come between his birth and death.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE MARCH OUT OF EGYPT.

THE argument in Chapter XI is this: Two millions of people, scattered over a large tract of country, were all warned to leave at midnight and march out of Egypt, which they did the very day they were warned, which is impossible; therefore, "the Pentateuch is unhistorical."

This impossibility is augmented by the fact that in the city of London there are 264 births every day.

Colenso assumes that *every* Hebrew man and woman left Egypt that day, which the story does not claim. It is not even stated so in general terms. This must be shown before this last argument can have any force.

Let us look at the facts: They had, at least, four days' warning, (Ex. xii, 3, 6,) and probably

longer, and knew whither they were going, (vs. 25 and 26.) Verse 36 says, "The Lord gave the people favor in the sight of the Egyptians, so that they lent unto them such as they required." Verse 33: "And the Egyptians were *urgent* upon the people that they might send them out of the land in *haste*."

True, there was an immense multitude to be fitted out, but there was an immense multitude to fit them out, and the very strongest possible motives to make the Egyptians aid them. The question is simply this: Could one family, with all the aids which the Egyptians could give them, pack up and move from Rameses, one day's journey to Succoth, where they encamped—because this name simply signifies where they stopped—called Succoth on account of the booths or tents they pitched there? If one family could thus march out, then all could; for each family had only its own necessities to attend to.

A regiment of men can strike their tents and

be on the march in half an hour, simply because there are a thousand men to do the work. According to Colenso, it would take several days with all Israel to do the work, and all the Egyptians working for their lives to help them. "According to the story," the march out of Egypt was comparatively easy, and, therefore, so far as Chapter XI goes, the Pentateuch is historical.

CHAPTER XV.

THE SHEEP AND CATTLE OF THE ISRAELITES IN
THE DESERT.

COLENZO quotes extensively from Canon Stanley, showing the nature of the country through which the Israelites must have journeyed in passing from the Red Sea to Sinai. I will give it, to show how Colenso leaps over centuries as nothing; to maintain a weak point:

“The wind drove us to shore—the shores of Arabia and Asia. We landed in a driving sand-storm, and reached this place, Ayun-Musa, the wells of Moses. It is a strange spot, this plot of tamarisks, with its seventeen wells, *literally an island in the desert*, and now used as the Richmond of Suez, a comparison which chiefly serves to show what a place Suez itself must be. Behind that African range lay Egypt,

with all its wonders—the green fields of the Nile, the immense cities, the greatest monuments of human power and wisdom. *On this Asiatic side begins immediately a wide circle of level desert, stone, and sand*, free as air, but with no trace of human habitation or art, where they might wander, as far as they saw, forever and ever. And between the two rolled the deep waters of the Red Sea, rising and falling with the tides, which, except on its shores, none of them could have seen—the tides of the great Indian Ocean, unlike the still, dead waters of the Mediterranean Sea.

“The day after leaving Ayun-Musa was at first within sight of the blue channel of the Red Sea. But soon Red Sea and all were lost in a sand-storm, which lasted the whole day. (I have retained this account of the sand-storm, chiefly because it seems to be a phenomenon peculiar to this special region. VAN EGMONT, NIEBUHR, MISS MARTINEAU, all noticed it; and it was just as violent at the passage of a friend in 1841,

and again of another, two months after ourselves, in 1853.) Imagine all distant objects entirely lost to view—the sheets of sand floating along the surface of the desert, like streams of water, the whole air filled with a tempest of sand, driving in your face like sleet.

“We were, undoubtedly, on the track of the Israelites; and we saw the spring, which most travelers believe to be Marah, and the two valleys, one of which must almost certainly, both perhaps, be Elim. The general scenery is either immense plains, [that is, *bare and barren plains of sand*, or, latterly, a succession of water-courses, as described below,] exactly like the dry bed of a Spanish river. These gullies gradually bring you into the heart of strange black and white mountains. *For the most part the desert was absolutely bare.* But the two rivals for Elim are fringed with trees and shrubs, *the first vegetation we have met in the desert.* First, there are the wild palms, successors of the ‘threescore and ten,’ not like those of Egypt or

of pictures, but either dwarf, that is, trunkless, or else with savage, hairy trunks, and branches all disheveled. Then there are the feathery tamarisks, here assuming gnarled boughs and hoary heads, on whose leaves is found what the Arabs call manna. Thirdly, there is the wild acacia, but this is also tangled by its desert growth into a thicket—the tree of the burning bush and the shittim-wood of the tabernacle. . . . A stair of rock brought us into a glorious wady, inclosed between red granite mountains, descending precipitously upon the sands. I can not too often repeat that these wadys are exactly like rivers, *except in having no water*; and it is this appearance of torrent-bed and banks, and clefts in the rocks for tributary streams, and at times even rushes and shrubs fringing their course, which gives to the whole wilderness a doubly dry and thirsty aspect—signs of ‘*water, water, everywhere, and not a drop to drink!*’”

From this description of the country, as it is to-day, Colenso is unable to see how the Israel-

ites could feed their cattle in the desert, and concludes that "therefore the Pentateuch is unhistorical."

A writer in the "Christian Observer" remarks, "that the bordering countries, Moab, Midian, etc., were then far more prosperous than now, on account of the curse pronounced upon them in Jer. xlviii, Ezek. xxv, 35," etc. According to the story, we are left to believe that the Israelites spread over the country, as wandering tribes now do, having the tabernacle as their head-quarters. Surely, there were men, women, and children enough to watch and herd the cattle.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE NUMBER OF THE ISRAELITES COMPARED WITH
THE EXTENT OF THE LAND OF CANAAN.

COLENSO'S argument in Chapter XIII is this:

God said he would drive out the inhabitants of Canaan little by little, lest the beasts of the field should multiply against them.

But Colenso says the Israelites would have settled the country twice as thickly as the counties of Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex, and therefore there could have been no danger from the beasts of the field; and therefore "the Pentateuch is unhistorical."

Now for the facts: Colenso figures on the little spot of land divided among the tribes. God figured on the country between the River of Egypt and the River Euphrates, (Gen. xv, 18.) Add to this fact another, namely, that

fire-arms were unknown to the Israelites, and Chapter XIII goes the way of all the rest of the Bishop's infidelity.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE NUMBER OF THE FIRST-BORN COMPARED
WITH THE NUMBER OF MALE ADULTS.

THE argument in Chapter XIV is this:

There were 600,000 warriors, therefore, probably 900,000 males of all ages, but only 22,273 first-borns. Therefore, each mother must have had forty-two children. This, Colenso says, is impossible; therefore, "the Pentateuch is unhistorical."

Let us see what a careful examination of the text will lead us to in reference to *the time when this covenant of first-born commences.*

Verse 13 tells us that "all the first-born are mine." Why? Because "*on the day that I smote all the first-born in the land of Egypt, I hallowed unto me all the first-born in Israel, both man and beast.*" This points out clearly

when the covenant began, and consequently *what* first-borns are meant. That this is *not* retrospective is further substantiated by the following facts: In Lev. xxvii, speaking of what they shall do *in connection with the year of Jubilee*, consequently future, "only the first-ling of the beasts, which should be the Lord's, no man shall sanctify it; whether it be ox, or sheep: it is the Lord's," (v. 26.)

Again, (Ex. xiii, 13 :) "And all the first-born of man *among thy* CHILDREN shalt thou redeem." Again, (Ex. xiii, 2 :) "Sanctify unto me all the first-born, whatsoever OPENETH the womb among the children of Israel."

Again, it is a law of interpretation, that, when an interpretation makes an author of *known ability* a fool, the fault is to be charged *rather* upon the interpretation than upon the author. Now, when there is no reason in the text why this covenant should be retrospective, and according to the common-sense of all compacts that it should not be, we are in the pres-

ence of the evidence (Num. iii, 13, and Ex. xiii, 13) bound to believe the plainer interpretation, especially when that removes the charge of imbecility from an author of Moses' *accuracy* and *power*.

The 22,273 first-borns number the mothers *since* the Passover, and not all the mothers. Consequently, this removes Colenso's difficulty. That this is the correct understanding is further shown by the following calculations: The total number of the Levites, $22,300 = 7,500$, (v. 22,) plus $8,600$, (v. 28,) plus $6,200$, (v. 34,) $= 22,300$; whereas only $22,000$ were available as substitutes for the first-born. The other 300 were, undoubtedly, first-born of the Levites, and must stand for themselves. The first-born of the Levites are in the proportion of 300 to $22,000$; that is, 1 to 74 . The $600,000$ fighting men would be about one-third of the male population. The male population would be $1,800,000$. This divided by $22,000$, the first-borns, have the rate of 1 to 81 . If the warriors were a little more

than one-third, and still less than one-half of the males, we would have 1 to 74, the proportion of first-born among the Levites. See, on this point, Mahan, page 122; also Poole, Num. iii, 39. Surely, there can be no difficulty in believing that 1 in 74 of the males should have had a first-born in two years.

The fact that this removes the difficulty *indicates* that the covenant was not retrospective; that is, it included only the first-borns *since* the Passover. And as there is nothing against it in the text, it is PROBABLE, at all events *possible*, and if POSSIBLE, the objection of Colenso can not prove the "story false." Therefore, it *may* be true, so far as Chap. XIV goes.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE SOJOURNING OF THE ISRAELITES IN EGYPT,
AND THE EXODUS IN THE FOURTH
GENERATION.

IN Chapter XV Colenso shows that the Israelites sojourned in Egypt two hundred and fifteen years, from the descent of Jacob to the exodus under Moses. *Granted.*

In Chapter XVI Colenso labors to show the exodus in the fourth generation. Let us see. In one sense true; namely, Moses and Aaron, who were the head and front of the exodus, were of the *fourth* generation; namely, Levi, Kohath, Amram, and Moses; that is, fifty-four years to each generation; quite possible in a long-lived family. But is it fair to take a few special cases, and deduce a sweeping rule, contrary to the plain statements of Scriptures?

Evidently *not*, and it can be done only when a hard case is to be made out against evidence. Feeling embarrassed by the genealogies given in 1 Chron. vii, Colenso rejects the whole account as contradictory and impossible. And to justify this rejection he affirms (page 158) that "in truth the account of Joshua's descent in 1 Chron. vii, involves a palpable contradiction. Thus, in verse 24, we are told that Ephraim's *daughter* built two villages in the land of Canaan. If we suppose this to mean that the *descendants* of Ephraim's daughter, after the conquest in the time of Joshua, did this, yet in verses 22, 23 we have this most astonishing fact stated, that Ephraim himself, after the slaughter by the men of Gath of his descendants in the *seventh* generation, 'mourned many days,' and then married again, and had a son, Beriah, who was the *ancestor of Joshua*! This Beriah, however, is not named at all among the sons of Ephraim in the list given in Num. xxvi, 35."

I will here give Mahan's reply to this point.

Seeking the truth I will not go around a correct exposition because it is another's:

“He has not only failed to read with his mind, but even his eyes in this instance have failed to serve him. Ephraim's family list, as is common enough in Scripture, contains several genealogies along side of one another. It begins with Shuthelah, the first-born, and then goes on with ‘his son’ and ‘his son,’ and so on for six generations. It then comes back to the second and third sons of Ephraim, ‘Ezer and Elead, whom the men of *Gath* slew, because they came down to take their cattle.’ It then relates the birth of a *fourth* son of Ephraim, *Beriah*, and proceeds with ‘his son,’ and so on. Finally, it gives a *fifth* son of Ephraim, *Edau* or *Erau*, and comes to Joshua in the fourth generation from Ephraim. This the reader will readily perceive if he will observe that the *sons* of Ephraim are connected by a copulative, as ‘and,’ while the grandsons and other lineal descendants are distinguished by the phrase, ‘and his son.’”

If we reject the exposition of the LXX which puts Laadan, (v. 26,) in the dative to distinguish him as a son of Ephraim, and call Laadan the son of Tahan, we then have Joshua in the ninth generation, which may not be far from the truth. It can not be called *impossible*. Taking Browne's and Mahan's exposition, sustained by the LXX, we have Joshua in the fifth generation. In either case there is no *impossibility*, and no conflict with the *Word*. So, understand this as you choose, and you do not involve us in any difficulty.

Colenso wants a contradiction in this story, so he manufactures it out of the whole cloth, by calling *Eyer* and *Elead* the *seventh* generation, while the text distinctly names them as the sons of Ephraim himself.

I prefer to regard Joshua as of the ninth generation; namely, 1. Beriah; 2. Resheph, who was not the son but the brother of Rephah, as shown by the word "also," which connects them, (v. 25;) 3. Telah; 4. Tahan; 5. Laadan; 6. Ammihud; 7. Elishama; 8. Non; 9. Je-

hoshua. And it is not difficult to believe that he associates with Eleagar of the *fifth*. Colenso calls Eleagar of the *fourth*, (page 158,) but he was the son of Aaron, and consequently of the *fifth*. How often, even now, we see children years older than some of their uncles!

We now have 215 years and 9 generations, that is, $23\frac{8}{9}$ years, or nearly 24 years for each generation. We need only look about us even in *moderate* America, to see generations more closely set together than this. Let us examine *the story* still further. We read (Gen. l, 23,) that Joseph saw the third generation of Ephraim's children. Ephraim was Joseph's second son. Now, how many years were consumed in this? Joseph was about thirty-five when Ephraim was born. He was thirty when he stood before Pharaoh, (Gen. xli, 46.) He married after that, for he was taken out of prison to interpret the dream, (Gen. xli, 14.) "And unto Joseph were born two sons before the years of famine," (Gen. xl, 50.)

Joseph was fifty-six when Ephraim was twenty-one. Joseph lived to be 110. After Ephraim was twenty-one, Joseph lived $110 - 56 = 54$, and in that 54 years he saw the third generation of Ephraim's children; that is, 18 years to each generation. At this rate Joshua might have been of the tenth generation, allowing him to be forty-four at the exodus, counting from the birth of Ephraim, nine years before the descent into Egypt. If the Bishop will carefully *figure* from his own premises, he will find that *figures* are *stubborn things*.

Every honest scholar will admit that in the Hebrew genealogies names are often omitted. They seem to wish only the leading distinctive characters. This is shown by a comparison of the genealogies of Matthew and Luke. The relation of father and son was often applied to persons several generations apart, and meant, often, only that they were of the same family. So much for Chap. XVI, which was purposed to draw out all the generations to fifty-four

years each. I do not wonder that the Bishop worked so hard at this point, because upon this depends his next chapter, which is the strongest point in his book. Let us examine it.

CHAPTER XIX.

NUMBER OF THE ISRAELITES AT THE EXODUS.

IN Chap. XVII we find some of the boldest assumptions and most arbitrary calculations in the whole volume.

Argument: 215 years, 4 generations, 56 persons as a basis; result, 3,000,000. Impossible. Therefore, the Pentateuch is unhistorical.

I will not go into the arbitrary assumptions by which he tries to show that there could have been only 5,000 warriors instead of 600,000, (page 153,) but will simply give the figures.

Colenso says, (page 68,) "Benjamin must have been more than twenty-two" at the descent, because he was born before Joseph was sold. Suppose he was thirty. He had ten sons, (Gen. xlvii, 21,) "possibly by more than one wife," (Colenso, page 68.) Now Calculate: In 30 years

there would have been 100; in 60 years, 1,000; in 90 years, 10,000; in 120 years, 100,000; in 150 years, 1,000,000; in 180 years, 10,000,000; in 210 years, 100,000,000. This makes no account of the children born to the parents after they were thirty, and it omits the millions of the sixth and seventh generations. And all this from one son, what would it have been from the twelve sons of Jacob? Surely, 3,000,000 from 54 is not difficult; for figures are stubborn things.

Now look at Schenchzer's calculation on the basis of *four* generations. The reader will find it quoted in Clarke's Commentary, (Num. i.) He shows that the 625,850 males in mature years were *easily* the product of *four* generations.

If mathematics are worth any thing, they take the strength out of Colenso's 15th, 16th, and 17th chapters, and, therefore, the Pentateuch is mathematically historical.

CHAPTER XX.

THE REMAINING OBJECTIONS.

CHAPTER XVIII—"The Danites and Levites at the time of the exodus." Argument: Dan had one son—therefore, he would have had 27 warriors instead of 62,700.

Colenso counts only four generations when there were from seven to ten. Dan had one son. If this son had only five sons, and increasing at this rate, there might have been in the eighth generation over 77,000. The Bishop can not believe that Dan's descendants could outnumber Benjamin's. I ask, where is the *impossibility*?

By similar assumptions the Levites would have been only 44 instead of 8,500. If the story recorded 44 Levites, Colenso could not have believed that because the assumption of the calculation is absurd.

Because the Levites only increased 1,000 during the journey, he charges the story with inconsistency, and his proof is this: He *assumes* that they were free from the sentence that the Israelites should die in the wilderness, and says this is clear because, in Num. ii, 33, the Levites were not *numbered* among the children of Israel. Is it clear that they were, therefore, not Israelites? The fallacy is his wrong use of the term "*numbered*," meaning "*counted*, not *considered*." Colenso either saw this fallacy, or he did not. If he did, he is dishonest. If he did not, he is *very weak*. I will not consume more time with answering such idle *cavils*. They show the weakness of his cause and the perverseness of his purpose.

The next objection is Chapter XX—"The number of the priests at the exodus, compared with their duties and with the provisions made for them."

The many offerings and cleansings to be attended to for so large a multitude, and only

three priests, and these could neither do the work, nor eat what was brought to them.

I will only let the Bishop answer this himself. He says, (page 80,) "The *ministering* Levites from thirty to fifty years old were 8,580."

If a man contracts to make uniforms for 20,000 soldiers, must he sew every stitch himself?

Chapter XXI is a repetition of the same point in reference to the Passover, and the same principle of common-sense interpretation removes the difficulty. The objection is equally against the Passover at the Temple.

The last chapter (XXII) is concerning the "war on Midian;" and, after reiterating what we have been reviewing, he strikes his last note on the cruelty of God's destroying the Midianites.

I simply ask, Could not God have slain them by pestilence? and where is the difference in the moral quality? After the Bishop has destroyed the New Testament, won't he be so kind as to wipe out the scheme of Providence, as seen un-

folding in history, and then figure away as "inconceivable" the system of nature?

I will add but a few more words. As a student of theology, I welcome any assault upon the Bible, because I know that the more it is investigated, the more it is criticised, the clearer will be its evidence, and the more unquestionable its authority.

The mountain oak is a given quantity of germ and nourishment, combined with a given amount of storm and tempest. God's Word is so much truth from Him, so much *felt want* in the race, combined with so much criticism and scrutiny. It stands among us, its roots in God's eternity, its boughs overarching the world, dropping their fragrance and their fruit into these weary years, and its top is gilded by the light around the throne. Father, let me repose beneath its protection here and enjoy its fruit up yonder, and unto Thee with the Son and with the Holy Ghost I will give ceaseless praises in that infinite forever beyond the vale.

BS1225.C65 F6
Fowler, Charles Henry, bp., 1837-1908.
Colenso's fallacies : another review of

BS
1225
C65
F6

Fowler, Charles Henry, bp., 1837-1908.
Colenso's fallacies: another review
Bishop of Natal, with an introductory
and review of part II, by Rev. Henry B
ter. Cincinnati, Poe & Hitchcock, 186
139p. 18cm.

1. Colenso, John William, bp. of Na
1814-1883. The Pentateuch and book of
critically examined. I. Bannister, H
1812-1883. II. Title.

334155

CO

